ISSN 0093-4666 © 2010. Mycotaxon, Ltd. ISSB 2154-8889

MYCOTAXON

DOI: 10.5248/114.501

Volume 114, pp. 501–505 *October–November 2011*

Fungal nomenclature. Summary of recent decisions by the Nomenclature Committee for Fungi

Lorelei L. Norvell

llnorvell@pnw-ms.com

Secretary, IAPT Permanent Nomenclature Committee for Fungi

Abstract — Recent decisions made by the IAPT permanent Nomenclature Committee for Fungi (NCF) cover 17 proposals to conserve or protect fungal names. Recommendations on 10 sets of proposals to amend the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature (including the governance of fungal nomenclature, name deposition, electronic publication, sanctiotypification, and Art. 59) and decisions on two cases of near homonymy and one of orthography are also reported.

In preparation for IBC2011 (the XVIII International Botanical Congress, Melbourne, Australia, 23–30 July, 2011), the IAPT permanent Nomenclature Committee for Fungi (NCF) reports on votes from two ballots on proposals to conserve or reject fungal names and announces recommendations on proposals to amend the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature to help guide non-mycologists during the pre-Congress paper ballot and final voting at the July 18–22 Nomenclature Section.

The 14 voting NCF members are Lee Crane (Urbana-Champaign IL), Chairman Vincent Demoulin (Liege), David Hawksworth (Madrid/London), Teresa Iturriaga (Caracas), Paul Kirk (Egham), Pei-Gui Liu (Kunming), Tom May (Melbourne), Jacques Melot (Reykjavík), Secretary Lorelei Norvell (Portland OR), Shaun Pennycook (Auckland), Christian Printzen (Frankfurt), Scott Redhead (Ottawa), Svengunnar Ryman (Uppsala), and Dagmar Triebel (München). As a 9-vote minimum is required for the NCF to recommend or reject a conservation proposal, only those proposals showing a greater than 60% majority can be considered to have passed out of Committee.

Published nomenclatural proposals and NCF reports can be downloaded from [www.ingentaconnect.com/content/iapt/tax] (the Taxon website),

while all previous and current NCF commentaries, important committee correspondence, and interim reports are available via the International Mycological Association website [http://www.ima-mycology.org/CFF].

Proposals to conserve or reject fungal names

* = proposal decisions detailed in Norvell (2011: Taxon 60(1) in press).

The Committee recommends the following proposals:

*Prop. 1810, to conserve the name *Hemipholiota* against *Nemecomyces* (*Agaricales*, *Basidiomycota*) [Jacobsson & Holec 2008; Taxon 57: 641-642]

— 86% support

*Prop. 1828, to conserve the name *Aspicilia aquatica* against *Lichen mazarinus* (*Ascomycota*: *Pertusariales*: *Megasporaceae*) [Nordin & Jørgensen 2008; Taxon 57: 989]

—86% support

*Prop. 1831, to conserve the name *Mixia* against *Phytoceratiomyxa* (*Basidiomycota*) [Sugiyama & Katumoto 2008: Taxon 57: 991–992]

— 86% support

Prop. 1852, to conserve the name *Olivea tectonae* (T.S. Ramakr. & K. Ramakr.) R.L. Mulder against *Olivea tectonae* (Racib.) Thirum. (*Basidiomycota*). [Minnis & al. 2008: Taxon 57: 1355–1356]

— 93% support

*Prop. 1862, to conserve the name *Psoroma versicolor* (*Degeliella versicolor*) against *Psoroma subdescendens* (lichenized *Ascomycota*, *Pannariaceae*) [Fryday & Coppins 2009: Taxon 58: 293]

— 86% support

Prop. 1863, to conserve the name *Craterellus cinereus* (Pers. : Fr.) Donk with a conserved type against *Craterellus cinereus* Pers. (*Basidiomycota*) [Olariaga & al. 2009: Taxon 58: 294–295]

— 93% support

Prop. 1896, to conserve the name *Lichen lichenoides* (*Leptogium lichenoides*) against *Lichen tremelloides* and *L. tremella* (lichenized *Ascomycota*) [Jørgensen 2009, Taxon 58: 1002–1003]

— 71% support

*Prop. 1897, Proposal to reject the name *Lecidea epiploica* (lichenized *Ascomycota*) [Jørgensen & Nordin 2009: Taxon 58: 1003–1004]

— 93% support

*Prop. 1898, to conserve *Stirtonia* A.L. Sm, (lichenized *Ascomycota, Arthoniales*) against *Stirtonia* R. Gr. bis (*Bryophyta, Dicranales*) [Frisch & Thor 2009: Taxon 58: 1004]

— 86% support)

*Prop. 1899, to conserve the name *Hebeloma cylindrosporum* against *Hebeloma angustispermum* (*Basidiomycota*) [Vesterholt & al. 2009:Taxon 58: 1005]
— 93% support

*Prop. 1918, to conserve the name *Dermatocarpon* (*Placopyrenium*) *bucekii* against *Placidium steineri* (lichenized *Ascomycota, Verrucariaceae*) [Senkardesler 2010: Taxon 59: 294]
— 86% support

*Prop. 1919, to conserve *Lactarius* (*Basidiomycota*) with a conserved type [Buyck & al. 2010: Taxon 59: 295–296]
— 79% support

*Prop. 1926, to conserve *Cladia* against *Heterodea* (*Ascomycota*) [Lumbsch & al. 2010: Taxon 59: 643]
— 86% support

*Prop. 1945, to conserve the name *Thelephora comedens* (*Vuilleminia comedens*) with a conserved type (*Basidiomycota*) [Ghobad-Nejhad & Hallenberg 2010: Taxon 59: 1277–1278]
— 100% support

The Committee does not recommend the following proposals:

Prop. 1769, to conserve the name *Cortinarius speciosissimus* against *C. rubellus*. [Gasparini & al. 2007: Taxon 56: 596–597]
— 86% oppose

*Prop. 1829–30, to reject the names *Verrucaria thelostoma* (1829) and *Pyrenula umbonata* (1830) (lichenized *Ascomycota*) [Jørgensen 2008: Taxon 57: 990–991]
— Both opposed: (1829) by 71%; (1830) by 79%

The Committee is still considering the following proposals:

Prop. 1861, to conserve the name *Aspicilia farinosa* (*Ascomycota*: *Pertusariales*: *Megasporaceae*) with a conserved type [Nordin & Roux 2009: Taxon 58: 292]

Prop. 1888, to conserve the name *Glomus* (*Fungi, Glomeromycota, Glomerales*) as being of neuter gender [Kuyper 2009: Taxon 58: 647]
—Note: 93% support the proposal, which is retained for further discussion by request of Chair Demoulin.

Prop. 1927, to conserve the name *Agaricus rachodes* (*Basidiomycota*) with that spelling [Vellinga & Pennycook 2010: Taxon 59: 644]

Proposals to amend the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature

The following recommendations cover proposals unrelated to Art. 59:

Props. 16–20, to make clear that the *Code* covers the nomenclature of fungi, and to modify its governance with respect to names of organisms treated as fungi

[Hawksworth & al. 2009: Taxon 58: 658–659]

— 78% support (16—changing the title to the International Code of Botanical and Mycological Nomenclature) and 71% support Props. (17—replacing "plant/s" by "plant/s or fungus/i" throughout) and (18—provide for election of the NCF by an International Mycological Congress). At the moment simple majorities do not support either (19—to permit decisions on fungal proposals to be taken at an IMC) or (20—to make such decisions binding on the subsequent IBC Nomenclature section.)

Props. 48–51, to exclude the phylum *Microsporidia* from the *Code* [Redhead & al. 2009: Taxon 58: 669]

— 86% support all three proposals.

Props. 117–119, to make the pre-publication deposit of key nomenclatural information in a recognized repository a requirement for valid publication of organisms treated as fungi under the Code [Hawksworth & al. 2010: Taxon 59: 1297]

— 79% support all three proposals.

Props. 183–184, to require deposition of information concerning typification of names of fungal taxa, with an associated Recommendation [Gams 2010: Taxon 59: 1626–1627]

— 72% support both proposals

Props. 185–190, to amend Art. 15 (185—to clarify what is meant by sanctioning), Art. 36 (185–189—to permit the use of either Latin or English for valid publication), and to amend Art. 45 (190—to make Art. 45 applicable to groups similar to the *Microsporidia* but which are not covered by Props. 48–51) [Demoulin 2010, Taxon 59: 1627–1628]

— All supported: (185) by 86%; (186–189) by 79%; (190) by 71%.

Props. 203–213, to permit electronic publications to be effectively published under specified conditions [Special Committee on Electronic Publication 2010: Taxon 59: 1907]

— 79% support

Prop. 223–232, to amend articles regulating the typification of names in sanctioning works [Redhead & al. 2010: Taxon 59: 1910–1913]

— 71% do not support (223—delete Art. 7.8); a 57% simple majority supports (223–232—amend Art. 7.8) .

The following recommendations cover Art. 59 proposals:

Props. 172–174, to amend Article 59 concerning teleotypification of fungal names. [Gams & al. 2010: Taxon 59: 1297]

— 71% do not recommend (172) to delete Art. 59.7 and 64% do not support (174) to add Rec. 59A4 to classify a new anamorph under a teleomorph-typified generic name only when no suitable anamorph-typified generic name is available; (173), to alter Art. 59.7 so that teleomorph-typified names

in anamorphic genera need not be changed, is still under consideration with 57% currently opposing.

Props. 294–306, to define the new term 'teleotype' (294–5), to rename Chapter VI (306), and to modify Art. 59 to limit dual nomenclature and to remove conflicting examples and recommendations (296–305) [Redhead 2010: Taxon 59: 1927–1929]

— A strong majority (64–86%) supports all except 298, 300, and 303; the last three show majority (57%) support.

Props. 307–313, to harmonize Art. 59 in order to harmonize it with present practice, by raising the status of anamorph names (307–309), clarify the status of teleomorph- and anamorph-typified genera (310–311), and recommend that teleomorph-typified genera should be reserved to teleomorph-typified species and vice versa for anamorphs (312–313) [Gams & al. 2010: Taxon 1929–1930]

— All proposals are still under consideration. simple majorities support (307—57%) and do not support (308, 310–313—50%); there is no agreement on (309).

Other recommendations

The following recommendations cover near homonymy according to Art. 53.5 (1–2) and orthography (3).

(1) ***Calongea*** Healey & al. in Anales Jard. Bot. Madrid 66(51): 27. 2009 (*Pezizaceae*) and ***Calongia*** D. Hawksw. & Etayo in Lichenologist 42: 355-359. 2010 (mitosporic fungi).

— 93% considered the names are sufficiently alike to be confusable, and so they should be treated as homonyms, with priority granted to *Calongea* Healey & al.

(2) ***Phyllocratera*** Sérus. & Aptroot in Aptroot & al., Biblioth. Lichenol. 64: 132. 1997 (*Phyllobatheliaceae*) and ***Phyllocrater*** Wernham in J. Linn. Soc., Bot. 42: 90. 1914 (*Dicotyledones, Rubiaceae*).

— 64% considered the names are sufficiently alike to be confusable, and so they should be treated as homonyms, with priority granted to *Phyllocrater* Wernham. (The lower support in case (2) is attributable that two different kingdoms (*Fungi* vs. *Plantae*) are represented.

(3) Regarding the applicability of Art. 60.1 to the elements 'rhiz,' 'rrhiz,' 'riz,' or 'rriz' within a name:

—86% considered that the element should be spelled as written by the original author. Demoulin's Prop. 185 to amend the Code is an outgrowth of this discussion.